

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to correspondence filed November 20, 2009 in reference to application 10/748,133. Claims 1-14 are pending and have been examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 20, 2009 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

3. The amendment filed 20 November 2009 has been accepted and considered in this office action. Claims 1, 2, and 7-10 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heiny (US Patent 5,778,356) in view of Fielder (US PAP 2003/0191817).

7. Consider claim 1, Heiny teaches an information service apparatus for providing information to a terminal connected through a network in accordance with a request sent from the terminal (figure 4), the information service apparatus comprising:

an operation panel configured to display operation information on said information service apparatus (figure 4, monitor 116; column 7 line 53);

language correspondence judgment means for judging whether or not the information can be provided in a language designated by discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal (figure 17, user selecting client language, step 403, determination if client language is found; column 15 lines 5-7 and 20-26); and

language determination means for determining the language to be used in providing said information (figure 17, display language selected; column 15 lines 5-36),

wherein, when said language correspondence judgment means determines that said information in the language designated by said discrimination information cannot be provided, said language determination means sets a language used for displaying

Art Unit: 2626

said operation information on said operation panel as the language used for providing said information (default language is selected if client language is not available, column 15 lines 26-36.).

Heiny does not specifically teach selecting means for selecting a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel; and

said language determination means selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information.

In the same field of multi-lingual internet support, Fidler teaches selecting means for selecting a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use”); and

said language determination means selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use” when system cannot determine language. When combined with Heiny, this would be the “fall back mode” described with Hieny).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system default selection of Fidler with the system of Hieny in order to allow a user to select the language used in the “fall back mode” when a preferred language is not available.

Art Unit: 2626

8. Consider claim 3, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein a plurality of languages are supported as the language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel so as to use one language previously selected from among the plurality of languages when displaying the operation information on said operation panel (figure 8A and 8B show a plurality of supported languages that are user selectable; column 13 lines 51-column 14 line 2, also column 8 lines 42- column 9 line 45).

9. Consider claim 4, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 3, wherein, when the language designated by the discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal corresponds to none of said plurality of supported languages, said language correspondence judgment means judges that said information cannot be provided in the language designated by said discrimination information (if no result can be displayed in client or default language, null value is returned; column 15 lines 26-29).

10. Consider claim 6, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, wherein said information service apparatus is an image processing apparatus (figure 27 for instance shows an image of the system displayed on a screen.).

11. Consider claim 7, Heiny teaches an information display apparatus (figure 4) comprising:

information service request means for sending a send request to an information service apparatus that provides information through a network (knowledge base system on a network, see column 8 lines 6-52), the send request for requesting said information and designating a language used in displaying said information (figure 17, user selected client language, column 15 line 6); and

information display means for displaying said information received from said information service apparatus (figure 4, monitor 116; column 7 line 53),

wherein, when said information service apparatus is incapable of providing said information in the language designated by said information service request means, said information display means displays said information received from said information service apparatus in a language that is set by the information service apparatus based on a language used for displaying information on an operation panel of said information service apparatus (default language is selected if client language is not available, column 15 lines 26-36.).

Heiny does not specifically teach selecting means for selecting a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel; and

said language determination means selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information.

In the same field of multi-lingual internet support, Fidler teaches selecting means for selecting a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation

Art Unit: 2626

panel (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use”); and

said language determination means selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use” when system cannot determine language. When combined with Heiny, this would be the “fall back mode” described with Hieny).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system default selection of Fidler with the system of Hieny in order to allow a user to select the language used in the “fall back mode” when a preferred language is not available.

12. Consider claim 8, Heiny teaches an information service system (figure 4) comprising:

a terminal connected to a network (top portion of figure 4); and

an information service apparatus configured to send information to said terminal through said network in accordance with a request sent from said terminal (bottom portion 132; knowledge base server),

wherein said information service apparatus comprises:

an operation panel configured to display operation information corresponding to said information service apparatus (figure 4, monitor 116; column 7 line 53);

language correspondence judgment means for judging whether or not the information can be provided in a language designated by discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal (figure 17, user selecting client language, step 403, determination if client language is found; column 15 lines 5-7 and 20-26); and

language determination means for determining the language to be used in providing said information, wherein, when said language correspondence judgment means determines that said information in the language designated by said discrimination information cannot be provided, said language determination means sets a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel as the language used for providing said information (figure 17, default language is selected if client language is not available, column 15 lines 26-36); and

said terminal displays said information in the language determined by said language determination means (figure 17 steps 404 and 407, displaying information in language selected).

Heiny does not specifically teach an interface configured to receive a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel; and

said language determination means selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information.

In the same field of multi-lingual internet support, Fidler teaches an interface configured to receive a selection of a language used for displaying said operation

Art Unit: 2626

information on said operation panel (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use”); and

said language determination means selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use” when system cannot determine language. When combined with Heiny, this would be the “fall back mode” described with Hieny).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system default selection of Fidler with the system of Hieny in order to allow a user to select the language used in the “fall back mode” when a preferred language is not available.

13. Consider claim 9, Heiny teaches an information service method for providing information from an information service apparatus to a terminal connected to said information service apparatus through a network in accordance with a request sent from said terminal (figure 17), comprising:

a language correspondence judgment procedure performed by the information service apparatus of judging whether or not the information can be provided in a language designated by discrimination information contained in the request from said terminal (figure 17, user selecting client language, step 403, determination if client language is found; column 15 lines 5-7 and 20-26); and

a language determination procedure performed by the information service apparatus of determining the language to be used in providing said information (figure 17, display language selected; column 15 lines 5-36),

wherein, when said language correspondence judgment procedure determines that said language used for displaying said operation information on said information in the language designated by said discrimination information cannot be provided, said language determination procedure sets an operation panel language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel as the language used for providing said information (figure 17, default language is selected if client language is not available, column 15 lines 26-36).

Heiny does not specifically teach receiving at an interface of the service apparatus, a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel; and

said language determination procedure selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the language used for providing the information.

In the same field of multi-lingual internet support, Fidler teaches receiving at an interface of the service apparatus, a selection of a language used for displaying said operation information on said operation panel (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use”); and

said language determination procedure selects the languages selected by the selection means and used for displaying said operation on said operation panel as the

Art Unit: 2626

language used for providing the information (paragraph 0032 describes a menu for selected a default language for “system use” when system cannot determine language. When combined with Heiny, this would be the “fall back mode” described with Hieny).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system default selection of Fidler with the system of Hieny in order to allow a user to select the language used in the “fall back mode” when a preferred language is not available.

14. Claim 11 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 3, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

15. Claim 12 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 4, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

16. Claim 14 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 6, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

17. Claims 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heiny and Fidler as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Seiler, US Patent 7,412,374).

18. Consider claim 2, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, but does not specifically teach further comprising discrimination information existence judgment means for judging whether said discrimination information is contained in the request from said terminal, wherein said language determination means sets said operation panel language as said language used for providing said information when said discrimination information existence judgment means judges that said discrimination information is not contained in the request from said terminal.

In the same field of language determination, Seiler teaches discrimination information existence judgment means for judging whether said discrimination information is contained in the request from said terminal, wherein said language determination means sets said operation panel language as said language used for providing said information when said discrimination information existence judgment means judges that said discrimination information is not contained in the request from said terminal (Figures 6A and 6B show a flowchart for selecting a language, described column 6 lines 35-62. Within this flowchart, determination is made whether each language selection option is present, for instance step 625 described line 33, and if not finds the language information from the next source, step 630 described line 35.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to deal with missing language information by going onto the next source as taught by Seiler when selecting language information is Heiny in order to properly handle a situation where a user failed to select a client language for a query.

Art Unit: 2626

19. Claim 10 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 2, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

20. Claims 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heiny and Fidler as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Krishnamurthy et al. (Key differences between HTTP/1.0 and HTTP/1.1).

21. Consider claim 5, Heiny teaches the information service apparatus as claimed in claim 1, but does not specifically teach wherein the request from said terminal is a HTTP request, and said discrimination information is a value of an Accept-Language field included in said HTTP request.

In the same field of information retrieval, Krishnamurthy teaches using an HTTP request (abstract and introduction), and with discrimination information being a value of an Accept-Language field included in said HTTP request (section 10, content negotiation discusses using “Accept-language” fields to inform servers what languages are acceptable to a user, paragraphs 1 and 5).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use HTTP and “accept—language” as taught by Krishnamurthy in the system of Heiny in order to implement the system of Heiny in a well know and universally accepted protocol language.

Art Unit: 2626

22. Claim 13 is a method requiring similar limitations to the apparatus of claim 5, and is therefor rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Seiler et al. (US Patent 7,412,374) describes user selection of default languages for system use.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS C. GODBOLD whose telephone number is (571)270-1451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:00am-4:30pm Friday 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571) 272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DCG

/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626